

# **EXHIBIT A**



1 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendants Google  
2 LLC (“Google”) and YouTube, LLC (“YouTube”) (collectively, “Defendants”) hereby object and  
3 respond to Plaintiffs’ Notice and Request for Production of Documents, Set 3 (“Requests”), as  
4 follows:

5 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

6 Defendants’ responses reflect only the current state of Defendants’ knowledge and  
7 information gained through their reasonable investigation in this action regarding the documents  
8 and information Plaintiffs have requested. Defendants’ investigation and discovery in this action are  
9 continuing, and Defendants are continuing to evaluate what information may exist, how far back it  
10 is kept, and what burden may be associated with identifying and producing information, even if it  
11 exists. Defendants may learn of additional documents and information pertaining to the Requests.  
12 Defendants expressly reserve the right to revise or supplement their responses to the Requests  
13 without assuming any additional obligation to do so.

14 A response to a Request shall not be deemed a waiver of any applicable objection, including  
15 privilege, immunity, or protection, or an admission of relevancy. Defendants make any response on  
16 the condition that the inadvertent production and/or disclosure of privileged or otherwise protected  
17 information does not waive any of Defendants’ rights to protect such information, all of which are  
18 expressly reserved, and that Defendant may withdraw any such information inadvertently produced  
19 and/or disclosed as soon as identified. *See* Dkt. No. 248. By producing or agreeing to produce  
20 documents or information in response to any Request, Defendants do not concede that any aspect  
21 of Plaintiffs’ claims related to those topics are permissible under Section 230, the First Amendment  
22 to the United States Constitution and corresponding provisions of applicable State constitutions, or  
23 are otherwise relevant to this litigation. Defendants reserve the right to challenge the authenticity,  
24 admissibility, or use of any document produced, or information provided, in response to the  
25 Requests including without limitation in any hearing, proceeding, trial, or otherwise.

26 Any failure of Defendants to make a specific objection to any specific Request is not an  
27 admission that documents or information responsive to that Request exist. Likewise, any statement  
28 in this response that Defendants will produce documents or information in response to a specific

Request does not mean that Defendants in fact have any such documents, or that any such documents exist, or that Defendants will search all files maintained by any person or any source. In light of the breadth of the Requests and the ongoing nature of investigation and discovery, Defendants will produce non-privileged, non-protected documents and log privileged or work-product documents responsive to the Requests, if any, and as described herein (1) subject to any and all objections noted below; (2) on a rolling basis; and (3) subject to the provisions of (a) the ESI Protocol entered in the above-titled action (*see* Dkt. No. 690), (b) the privilege log protocol entered in the above-titled action (*see* Dkt. No. 740), (c) the MDL Protective Order (*see* Dkt. No. 586), and (d) the 502(d) Order (*see* Dkt. No. 248). This includes, but is not limited to, production from an agreed-upon list of custodians as well as other reasonable methods and parameters.

# **OBJECTIONS TO INSTRUCTIONS, RULES OF CONSTRUCTION, AND** **DEFINITIONS**

The following Objections apply to and are incorporated by reference into each and every response to the separately-numbered Requests as if set forth in full therein. From time to time a specific response may repeat one of these Objections for emphasis or for some other reason. The failure to repeat any of these Objections in any specific response shall not be interpreted as a waiver of any Objection to that response.

1. Defendants object to the Definitions, Rules of Construction, Instructions, and Requests to the extent they seek to impose on Defendants obligations over and above those contained in the applicable law, including, but not limited to, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, the Standing Order for Discovery in Civil Cases before Judge Kang, or any other applicable rule, order, or law.

2. Defendants object to each of the Definitions, Rules of Construction, and Instructions to the extent that they call for the production of “all” documents or information described. Unless otherwise stated, Defendants will construe each Request to require Defendants to use only reasonable diligence to locate responsive documents or information subject to the provisions of the ESI Protocol entered into by the Parties in this matter (*see* Dkt. No. 690) and the Protective Order (*see* Dkt. No. 586) through a search of the documents of an agreed-upon and Court-ordered list of

1 custodians using the negotiated search terms over the applicable Relevant Time Period, and, if  
2 appropriate, non-custodial sources from which the collection and search for potentially relevant  
3 information is proportional to the needs of this case. Defendants object to the Requests to the extent  
4 that they purport to require Defendants to conduct anything other than a reasonable and diligent  
5 search for reasonably accessible files, including electronically-stored information, from accessible  
6 sources where responsive documents reasonably would be expected to be found. Any specific  
7 Request that seeks to require Defendants to exceed such a search is overly broad and unduly  
8 burdensome.

9         3. Defendants object to the definition of “Communication” to the extent it exceeds the  
10 scope contemplated by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the United States  
11 District Court for the Northern District of California, or other applicable law. Defendants further  
12 object to the definition as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it encompasses  
13 information not relevant to the parties’ claims or defenses and would require Defendants to collect,  
14 review and/or produce information that is disproportionate to the needs of this case.

15         4. Defendants object to the definition of “Document” to the extent it exceeds the scope  
16 contemplated by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the United States District  
17 Court for the Northern District of California, or other applicable law. Defendants further object to  
18 the definition as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it encompasses information not  
19 relevant to the parties’ claims or defenses and would require Defendants to collect, review, and/or  
20 produce information that is disproportionate to the needs of this case.

21         5. Defendants object to the definition of “Electronically Stored Information” or “ESI”  
22 to the extent it exceeds the scope contemplated by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local  
23 Rules of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, or other applicable  
24 law. Defendants further object to the definition as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent  
25 it encompasses information not relevant to the parties’ claims or defenses and would require  
26 Defendants to collect, review, and/or produce information that is disproportionate to the needs of  
27 this case.  
28

6. Defendants object to Plaintiffs’ definition of the term “Identity” as overbroad, unduly burdensome, seeking the production of information that is not relevant to the claim or defense of any party, not proportional to the needs of the case, and to the extent the information sought is not reasonably accessible to Defendants upon reasonable diligence. Defendants further object that the term “Identity,” as defined, seeks information that invades the right of privacy in violation of Article I, Section 1 of the California Constitution.

7. Defendants object to Plaintiffs’ definition of the term “Including” as overbroad, unduly burdensome, seeking the production of information that is not relevant to the claim or defense of any party, not proportional to the needs of the case, and to the extent the information sought is not reasonably accessible to Defendants upon reasonable diligence. In particular, the definition of “Including” fails to reasonably define the scope of information sought and seeks information that is duplicative, not relevant to the subject matter of this litigation, and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object on the ground that the definition of “Including” calls for information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, and potentially other applicable privileges or protections.

8. Defendants object to Plaintiffs’ definition of the term “Named Features” as seeking the production of information that is not relevant to the claims or defenses of any party and not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent the information sought includes documents or information pertaining to allegations that this Court held were barred by Section 230 and/or the First Amendment in its November 14, 2023 Order (Doc. 430) at 16-19, 22 because such allegations directly target Defendants’ roles as publishers of third-party content, including:

- Failing to put “[d]efault protective limits to the length and frequency of sessions”(MAC ¶ 845(e));
- Failing to institute “[b]locks to use during certain times of day (such as during school hours or late at night”(id. at ¶ 845(h));
- Not providing a beginning and end to a user’s “Feed” (id. at ¶ 845(i));
- Publishing geolocating information for minors (id. at ¶ 845(t));
- Recommending minor accounts to adult strangers (id. at ¶ 845(u));
- Limiting content to short-form and ephemeral content, and allowing private content (id. at ¶ 864(l));
- Timing and clustering of notifications of third-party content in a way that promotes addiction (id. at ¶ 845(l));
- Use of algorithms to promote addictive engagement (id. at ¶ 845(j)); and
- Timing and clustering of notifications of Defendants’ content to increase addictive use (id. at ¶ 845(l)).

1  
2 9. Defendants object to Plaintiffs’ definition of the terms “Policy” or “Policies” as  
3 vague, ambiguous, indefinite, overbroad, unduly burdensome, seeking the production of  
4 information that is not relevant to the claim or defense of any party, not proportional to the needs of  
5 the case, and to the extent the information sought is not reasonably accessible to Defendants upon  
6 reasonable diligence. In particular, the terms “Policy” and “Policies” are vague, ambiguous, and  
7 overbroad in their use of the undefined terms “formal and informal,” “systems,” “customs,”  
8 “methods and means of implementation” and “responsible for their management and  
9 implementation”, and in their requirement that Defendants “Identify” the “Persons responsible for  
10 the management of their implementation.”

11 10. Defendants object to Plaintiffs’ definition of the terms “Relating to,” “relate to,”  
12 “referring to,” “refer to,” “reflecting,” “reflect,” “concerning,” and “concern” as vague, ambiguous,  
13 indefinite, overbroad, unduly burdensome, seeking the production of information that is not relevant  
14 to the claim or defense of any party, not proportional to the needs of the case, and to the extent the  
15 information sought is not reasonably accessible to Defendants upon reasonable diligence. In  
16 particular, the definition of these terms fails to reasonably define the scope of information sought  
17 and seeks information that is duplicative, not relevant to the subject matter of this litigation, and not  
18 likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object on the ground that  
19 the definition calls for information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product  
20 doctrine, and potentially other applicable privileges or protections.

21 11. For purposes of responding to these Requests, “Relevant Geographic Area” means  
22 the United States of America, the European Union, the United Kingdom, and Australia. *See* Dkt.  
23 No. 953.

24 12. Defendants object to Plaintiffs’ definition of the term “Relevant Time Period” as  
25 vague, ambiguous, indefinite, overbroad, unduly burdensome, not proportional to the needs of the  
26 case, and inconsistent with the Court’s June 20, 2024, Order on the relevant time period applicable  
27 to Defendants (*see* Dkt. No. 953). Further, that the definition is overbroad, unduly burdensome and  
28 disproportional because it includes, inter alia, time periods for which claims would be barred under

1 the relevant statute of limitations, and time periods before and after the relevant underlying events.  
 2 Defendant also objects to Plaintiffs' proposed Relevant Time Period as unduly burdensome given  
 3 the huge quantities of data and documents that already would need to be collected, stored and  
 4 searched even for a shorter time period. For purposes of Defendants' responses to the Requests and  
 5 unless stated otherwise, "Relevant Time Period" means the period beginning January 1, 2015, and  
 6 ending on April 1, 2024, with two exceptions. For document discovery regarding YouTube's  
 7 recommendation system, including Watch Time, Relevant Time Period means the period beginning  
 8 January 1, 2011, and ending on April 1, 2024. For document discovery regarding YouTube Kids,  
 9 Relevant Time Period means the period beginning January 1, 2014, and ending on April 1, 2024.

10 13. Defendants object to Plaintiffs' definition of the term "Safety" as vague, ambiguous,  
 11 indefinite, overbroad, unduly burdensome, seeking the production of information that is not relevant  
 12 to the claim or defense of any party, not proportional to the needs of the case, and to the extent the  
 13 information sought is not reasonably accessible to Defendants upon reasonable diligence. In  
 14 particular, the term "Safety" is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad in its use of the undefined terms  
 15 "wellbeing," "safety" and "protection from risks." Defendants further object to the definition to the  
 16 extent that it includes "protection from risks of extortion, sextortion, trafficking, bullying,  
 17 harassment, CSAM victimization or revictimization, and predation," which arises from and is  
 18 dependent on third-party content and/or bad actors.

19 14. Defendants object to Plaintiffs' definition of the term "User Data" as vague,  
 20 ambiguous, indefinite, overbroad, unduly burdensome, seeking the production of information that  
 21 is not relevant to the claim or defense of any party, not proportional to the needs of the case, and to  
 22 the extent the information sought is not reasonably accessible to Defendants upon reasonable  
 23 diligence. In particular, the term "User Data" is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad in its use of the  
 24 undefined terms "all information concerning the user of an account," "any data you collect," and  
 25 "data related to the identity, behavior, activity, or characteristics of users."

26 15. Defendants object to Plaintiffs' definition of the terms "You," "Your," "Defendant,"  
 27 and "Defendants" on the grounds that the definition is overbroad, vague and ambiguous, and unduly  
 28 burdensome. Defendants further object to the definition to the extent it seeks information not



1 currently in the possession, custody, or control of Defendants. Defendants will respond solely on  
2 behalf of themselves (Google LLC and YouTube, LLC), and not any other subsidiaries or affiliates,  
3 or any other person or entity. Defendants further object to the definition on the grounds that it  
4 includes Defendants' attorneys and requires Defendants to provide a legal conclusion or to produce  
5 information that is protected by any privilege, including the attorney-client privilege, work product  
6 immunity doctrine, common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, immunity, or  
7 restriction on discovery. For purposes of responding to the Requests, "You," "Your," "Defendant,"  
8 and "Defendants" will be defined as Google LLC, YouTube, LLC, and those authorized agents and  
9 employees acting on its behalf and within the scope of their agency or employment.

10 16. Defendants object to Plaintiffs' definition of the term "Youth" as overbroad, unduly  
11 burdensome, seeking the production of information that is not relevant to the claim or defense of  
12 any party, and not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent the definition includes users  
13 who are 18 years old and older. For purposes of Defendants' responses to the Requests and unless  
14 stated otherwise, "Youth" means users who are under the age of 18.

15 17. Defendants object to Plaintiffs' definition of the term "YouTube Platform" because  
16 it is directed to the YouTube platform as a whole, rather than the specific features that the Court has  
17 concluded can provide the basis for a viable cause of action in this matter, and to the extent the  
18 information sought is not reasonably accessible to Defendants upon reasonable diligence.  
19 Defendants further object that the term "YouTube Platform" is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad in  
20 its use of the undefined terms "developed, tested, or made available for use," and "all features or  
21 surfaces accessible to some or all users of the platform."

22 18. Unless otherwise stated, Defendants will not withhold otherwise responsive and  
23 non-privileged draft versions of documents to the extent that Defendants collect and retain such  
24 drafts in the ordinary course of business and are able to locate such documents pursuant to a  
25 reasonable search, and to the extent the collection and production of this data is reasonable and  
26 proportional to the needs of this case. Defendants will only search for and collect draft versions of  
27 documents to the extent that those drafts are saved as separate documents and are collected and  
28 identified pursuant to the parties' agreement on date range, search terms, and custodians.

Defendants will not conduct a search for historic versions of a document created in Google Workspace. Defendants' discovery tools do not allow them to automatically collect each version of Google Workspace documents and so their collection would be unduly burdensome and not proportionate. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(B) ("A party need not provide discovery of electronically stored information from sources that the party identifies as not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost."). Defendants will not search for or produce, and thus will withhold, these historic "versions" of responsive documents on the basis of this objection.

The following responses to the Requests are provided subject to the foregoing Preliminary Statement and Objections, which are incorporated into each response.

### **OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION**

#### **DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 31:**

Documents that constitute, identify, or describe any Policies, tools, mechanisms, or other means for parents or guardians to monitor, limit, or control use of Your Platform by their Children or Teens ("Parental Controls") that You make available to parents during the Relevant Time Period.

#### **RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 31:**

Defendants object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent it seeks documents or other materials related to features for which the Court has held claims are barred by the First Amendment or Section 230 and to the extent the Request seeks documents or information relating to Parental Controls on other platforms or developed by third parties. Defendants object to this Request as vague and ambiguous in its use of the terms "ability" and "circumvent"; these vague terms make it unclear what behavior it is that the request seeks information regarding.

Defendants object to this Request to the extent it seeks information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privilege or protection and will withhold or redact as appropriate such information to the extent it exists. Defendants object to the extent that this Request calls for the production of proprietary, confidential, or trade secret information that is subject to the Protective Order and has little or no

**AMENDED RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 36:**

Defendants amend and supplement their response as follows:

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing objections, Defendants will conduct a reasonable search of the documents of agreed upon and Court-ordered custodians using the negotiated search terms for documents that concern the logged-in use of multiple YouTube accounts by United States users who are minors during the Relevant Time Period, as well as the ability of minor United States users to use YouTube in a logged-out state, and will produce non-privileged responsive documents. Defendants do not interpret this request to seek documents reflecting or discussing information only about individual YouTube users.

**DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 37:**

All Documents that constitute, identify, or describe any Policies, instructions, manuals, tools, mechanisms, or other means for users to cancel or deactivate their accounts (“Account Cancellation Process”) on Your Platform during the Relevant Time Period.

**RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 37:**

Defendants object to this Request to the extent it obligates them to produce “all” responsive documents, which is unduly burdensome, not proportional to the needs of this case, and not required under the Federal Rules. Defendants object to this Request to the extent it seeks information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privilege or protection and will withhold or redact as appropriate such information to the extent it exists. Defendants object to this Request to the extent the information requested therein is not within their possession, custody, and/or control; this Request seeks information that would be in the possession of third parties. Defendants object to the Request to the extent the information sought is already in the possession of Plaintiffs, or is otherwise equally accessible and available to them from other sources (including themselves, the public record, and non-parties). Defendants object that this Request is duplicative and cumulative of other discovery Requests; specifically, Request No. 32.

Defendants object to this Request to the extent that it seeks materials relating to users located outside of the United States and/or features not available in the United States. Defendants

1 object to this Request as unduly burdensome and not proportional to the needs of the case because  
2 the Request is not limited as to time.

3 Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing objections, Defendants will conduct a  
4 reasonable search for documents sufficient to explain the current final version of the user interface  
5 used to cancel, delete, and/or deactivate an account used to access YouTube as well as current final  
6 non-privileged versions of public-facing instructions and help pages related to account  
7 cancellation, deletion, and/or deactivation available during the Relevant Time Period, and will  
8 produce non-privileged responsive documents. To the extent Plaintiffs seek historical versions of  
9 cancellation related policies, instructions, or user interfaces, Defendants are willing to meet and  
10 confer with Plaintiffs to determine whether an agreement can be reached under which Defendants  
11 provide certain non-privileged historical final versions responsive to this Request and proportional  
12 to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Defendants to an undue burden.

13 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 37:**

14 Defendants amend and supplement their response as follows:

15 Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing objections, Defendants will conduct a  
16 reasonable search for documents sufficient to explain the current final version of the user interface  
17 used to cancel, delete, and/or deactivate an account used to access YouTube as well as current final  
18 non-privileged versions of public-facing instructions and help pages related to account  
19 cancellation, deletion, and/or deactivation available during the Relevant Time Period, and will  
20 produce non-privileged responsive documents. To the extent Plaintiffs seek historical versions of  
21 cancellation related policies, instructions, or user interfaces, Defendants are willing to meet and  
22 confer with Plaintiffs to determine whether an agreement can be reached under which Defendants  
23 provide certain non-privileged historical final versions responsive to this Request and proportional  
24 to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Defendants to an undue burden.  
25 Defendants will, subject to and without waiving its objections, also conduct a reasonable search of  
26 the documents of agreed upon and Court-ordered custodians using the negotiated search terms for  
27 documents that constitute, identify or describe YouTube's policies, instructions, manuals, tools,  
28

1 mechanisms, or other means for users to cancel or deactivate their accounts in the United States  
2 during the Relevant Time Period, and will produce non-privileged responsive documents.

3 **DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 38:**

4 Documents that constitute, identify, describe, or discuss any analysis of the efficacy of the  
5 Account Cancellation Process, including users' awareness of the Process, accessibility and ease of  
6 use of the Process, deterrence to use of the Process, the likelihood that the user completes the  
7 Process, the likelihood that the user reactivates their account or opens a new account, the actual or  
8 projected impact of the Process on the user's Engagement, and the actual or projected impact of  
9 the Process on the user's safety, health, wellbeing, or behavior.

10 **RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 38:**

11 Defendants object to this Request to the extent it obligates them to produce "any"  
12 responsive documents, which is unduly burdensome, not proportional to the needs of this case, and  
13 not required under the Federal Rules. Defendants object to this Request as overly broad, unduly  
14 burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of the case because, as drafted, the request is not  
15 tailored to Plaintiffs' remaining allegations and the way the YouTube Platform allegedly  
16 contributes to the alleged harm. Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad, not  
17 proportional to the needs of the case, and not relevant to any viable claim or defense in that it seeks  
18 discovery concerning non-minor and non-adolescent platform users. Defendants object to this  
19 Request as vague and ambiguous in its use of the terms "efficacy," "awareness," "accessibility,"  
20 "completes," "reactivates"; these vague terms make it unclear what behavior it is that the request  
21 seeks information regarding.

22 Defendants object to this Request to the extent it seeks information protected from  
23 disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable  
24 privilege or protection and will withhold or redact as appropriate such information to the extent it  
25 exists. Defendants object to this Request to the extent it requires Defendants to create or compile  
26 new documents or arrangements of information that do not already exist or are not already  
27 maintained in the ordinary course of business. Defendants object to the extent that this Request  
28 calls for the production of proprietary, confidential, or trade secret information that is subject to

**DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 50:**

Documents that demonstrate, reflect, or describe the account sign-up process for Your Platform in the United States during the Relevant Time Period, including text and graphics made available for review by potential users during the sign-up process, regardless of whether review or acknowledgment is required.

**RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 50:**

Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and not relevant to any viable claim or defense in that it seeks discovery concerning non-minor and non-adolescent platform users. Defendants object to this Request to the extent it seeks information protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privilege or protection and will withhold or redact as appropriate such information to the extent it exists. Defendants object to the Request to the extent the information sought is already in the possession of Plaintiffs, or is otherwise equally accessible and available to them from other sources (including themselves, the public record, and non-parties). Defendants object to this Request as unduly burdensome and not proportional to the needs of the case because the Request is not limited as to time.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing objections, Defendants will conduct a reasonable search for documents sufficient to show the current final versions of the user interfaces for Google and YouTube account creation, and will produce non-privileged responsive documents. To the extent Plaintiffs seek historical versions of these user interfaces, Defendants are willing to meet and confer with Plaintiffs to determine whether an agreement can be reached under which Defendants provide certain non-privileged historical final versions responsive to this Request and proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Defendants to an undue burden.

**AMENDED RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 50:**

Defendants amend and supplement their response as follows:

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing objections, Defendants will conduct a reasonable search for documents sufficient to show the current final versions of the user interfaces

1 for Google and YouTube account creation, and will produce non-privileged responsive documents.  
2 Defendants will, subject to and without waiving their objections, also conduct a reasonable search  
3 of the documents of agreed upon and Court-ordered custodians using the negotiated search terms  
4 for documents for documents that reflect or describe YouTube's and Google's account creation  
5 process in the United States during the Relevant Time Period, and will produce non-privileged  
6 responsive documents.

7 **DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 51:**

8 All terms of service for users of Your Platform in the United States during the Relevant  
9 Time Period.

10 **RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 51:**

11 Defendants object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not  
12 proportional to the needs of the case because "All terms of service" would implicate irrelevant  
13 versions. Defendants object to this Request to the extent it seeks information protected from  
14 disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, and/or any other applicable  
15 privilege or protection and will withhold or redact as appropriate such information to the extent it  
16 exists.

17 Defendants object to the extent that this Request calls for the production of proprietary,  
18 confidential, or trade secret information that is subject to the Protective Order and has little or no  
19 connection to the parties' claims and defenses in this action, imposing a further burden on  
20 Defendants that is disproportionate to the needs of this case. Defendants object to this Request to  
21 the extent that it seeks materials relating to third parties that would require Defendants to violate  
22 obligations to those third parties with respect to proprietary, confidential, or trade secret  
23 information. Defendants object to this Request to the extent that its expansive scope seeks users'  
24 personal identifying information and may implicate the privacy rights of users who are entitled to  
25 protection under various consumer privacy laws, including the Stored Communications Act.  
26 Affected users should also be afforded an opportunity to object to disclosure of their personal  
27 identifying information, and such an opportunity may be required as a matter of law. Where  
28 documents contain information barred from disclosure in addition to responsive information,



the internet generally, and will produce non-privileged responsive documents. To the extent Plaintiffs seek historical versions, Defendants are willing to meet and confer with Plaintiffs to determine whether an agreement can be reached under which Defendants provide certain historical final versions responsive to this Request and proportional to the needs of this case, in a manner that does not subject Defendants to an undue burden, and will produce non-privileged responsive documents.

**AMENDED RESPONSE TO DOCUMENT REQUEST NO. 53:**

Defendants amend and supplement their response as follows:

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing objections, Defendants will conduct a reasonable search of the documents of agreed upon and Court-ordered custodians using the negotiated search terms for documents that concern the effectiveness of YouTube's warning-related features (e.g., sensitive content warnings, age-restricted content, risky search pause page, civility reminders, etc.) and resources and educational materials provided to youth and parents regarding the safe use of YouTube and/or the internet generally in the United States during the Relevant Time Period, and will produce non-privileged responsive documents.

Dated: July 10, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

**WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI**

/s/ Lauren Gallo White

Lauren Gallo White (State Bar No. 309075)

lwhite@wsgr.com

Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati PC

One Market Plaza, Spear Tower, Suite 3300

San Francisco, CA 94105

Telephone: (415) 947-2000

Facsimile: (415) 947-2099

Brian M. Willen, *pro hac vice*

bwillen@wsgr.com

Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati PC

1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor

New York, New York 10019

Telephone: (212) 999-5800

Facsimile: (212) 999-5899

Christopher Chiou (State Bar No. 233587)

cchiou@wsgr.com



1 Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati PC  
2 953 East Third Street, Suite 100  
3 Los Angeles, CA 90013  
4 Telephone: (323) 210-2900  
5 Facsimile: (866) 974-7329

6 **WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP**

7 Joseph G. Petrosinelli  
8 JOSEPH G. PETROSINELLI, *pro hac vice*  
9 jpetrosinelli@wc.com  
10 ASHLEY W. HARDIN, *pro hac vice*  
11 ahardin@wc.com  
12 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP  
13 680 Maine Avenue, SW  
14 Washington, DC 20024  
15 Tel.: 202-434-5000

16 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

17 Yardena R. Zwang-Weissman (SBN 247111)  
18 yardena.zwang-weissman@morganlewis.com  
19 300 South Grand Avenue, 22nd Floor  
20 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132  
21 Tel.: 213.612.7238

22 Brian Ercole (*pro hac vice*)  
23 brian.ercole@morganlewis.com  
24 600 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1600  
25 Miami, FL 33131-3075  
26 Tel.: 305.415.3416

27 Stephanie Schuster (*pro hac vice*)  
28 stephanie.schuster@morganlewis.com  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
NW Washington, DC 20004-2541  
Tel.: 202.373.6595

*Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC and  
Google LLC*